arXiv:hep-ph/0508042v1 3 Aug 2005

Searching for effects of Spatial Noncommutativity via a Penning Trap

Jian-Zu Zhang *

Institute for Theoretical Physics, East China University of Science and Technology, Box 316, Shanghai 200237, P. R. China

Abstract

The possibility of testing spatial noncommutativity via a Penning trap is explored. The case of both space-space and momentum-momentum noncommuting is considered. Spatial noncommutativity leads to the spectrum of the orbital angular momentum of a Penning trap possessing fractional values, and in the limits of vanishing kinetic energy and subsequent vanishing magnetic field, this system has non-trivial dynamics. The dominant value of the lowest orbital angular momentum is $\hbar/4$, which is a clear signal of spatial noncommutativity. An experimental verification of this prediction by a Stern-Gerlach-type experiment is suggested.

* E-mail address: jzzhang@ecust.edu.cn

Studies of low energy effective theory of superstrings show that space is noncommutative [1]. Spatial non-commutativity is apparent near the Planck scale. Its modifications to ordinary quantum theory are extremely small. We ask whether one can find some low energy detectable relics of physics at the Planck scale by current experiments. Such a possibility is inferred from the incomplete decoupling between effects at high and low energy scales. For the purpose of clarifying phenomenological low energy effects, quantum mechanics in noncommutative space (NCQM) is available. If NCQM is a realistic physics, all the low energy quantum phenomena should be reformulated in it. In the literature, NCQM have been studied in detail [2–7]; many interesting topics, from the Aharonov-Bohm effect to the quantum Hall effect have been considered [8]. Recent investigation of the non-perturbation aspect of the deformed Heisenberg-Weyl algebra (the NCQM algebra) in noncommutative space shows [5] that, when the state vector space of identical bosons is constructed by generalizing one-particle quantum mechanics, in order to maintain Bose-Einstein statistics at the non-perturbation level described by deformed annihilation-creation operators, the consistent ansatz of commutation relations of the phase space canonical variables should include both space-space noncommutativity and momentum-momentum noncommutativity. This explores some new features of effects of spatial noncommutativity [5–7]. In [6] the possibility of testing spatial noncommutativity via Rydberg atoms is explored. But the measurement in experiments of Rydberg atoms depends on a characteristic frequency which is extremely high and may be difficult to reach by current experiments. For Penning traps [9–12] the situation is different. In this paper we show a possibility of testing spatial noncommutativity via a Penning trap. In [13] properties of a Penning trap at the level of NCQM are investigated. Spatial noncommutativity leads to the spectrum of the orbital angular momentum of a Penning trap possessing a fractional zero-point angular momentum, fractional values and fractional intervals. In the limit of vanishing kinetic energy this system has non-trivial dynamics. We find that in both limits of vanishing kinetic energy and the subsequent diminishing magnetic field the dominant value of the lowest orbital angular momentum in a Penning trap is $\hbar/4$. This result is a clear signal of spatial noncommutativity, and can be verified by a Stern-Gerlach-type experiment.

The objects trapped in a Penning trap are charged particles or ions. The trapping mechanism combines an electrostatic quadrupole potential $\phi = V_0(-\frac{1}{2}\hat{x}_i^2 + \hat{x}_3^2)/2d^2$ (i=1, 2) (Henceforth the summation convention is used) and a uniform magnetic field **B** aligned along the z axis. The parameters $V_0 (> 0)$ and d are the characteristic voltage and length. The particle oscillates harmonically with an axial frequency $\omega_z = (qV_0/\mu d^2)^{1/2}$ (charge $q > 0$) along the axial direction (the z-axis), and in the $x-y$ plane, executes a superposition of a fast circular cyclotron motion of a cyclotron frequency $\omega_c = qB/\mu c$ with a small radius and a slow circular magnetron drift motion of a magnetron frequency $\omega_m \equiv \omega_z^2/2\omega_c$ in a large orbit. Typically quadrupole potential V_0 superimposed upon the magnetic field B is a relatively weak addition in the sense that the hierarchy of frequencies is $\omega_m << \omega_z << \omega_c$. The Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ of a Penning trap can be decomposed into a two-dimensional Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_2$ and a one-dimensional harmonic Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_z$: $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_2 + \hat{H}_z$, $\hat{H}_z = \frac{1}{2\mu}\hat{p}_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}\mu\omega_z^2\hat{x}_3^2$, and $\hat{H}_2$ is [9–12]

$$\hat{H}_2 = \frac{1}{2\mu}\hat{p}_i^2 + \frac{1}{8}\mu\omega_p^2\hat{x}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2}\omega_c\epsilon_{ij}\hat{x}_i\hat{p}_j, \tag{1}$$

where μ is the particle mass, $\omega_p \equiv \omega_c(1 - 4\omega_m/\omega_c)$. If NCQM is a realistic physics, low energy quantum phenomena should be reformulated in this framework. Thus in the above we formulate the Hamiltonian of the Penning trap in terms of the deformed canonical variables $(\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_i)$ of noncommutative space. In order to explore the new features of such a Penning trap, our attention is focused on the investigation of $\hat{H}_2$ and the z component of the orbital angular momentum $\hat{L}_z = \epsilon_{ij}\hat{x}_i\hat{p}_j$.

In the following we review the background of the NCQM Algebra [5]. In order to develop the NCQM formulation we need to specify the phase space and the Hilbert space on which operators act. The Hilbert space can consistently be taken to be exactly the same as the Hilbert space of the corresponding commutative system [2].

As for the phase space we consider both space-space noncommutativity (space-time noncommutativity is not considered) and momentum-momentum noncommutativity. There are different types of noncommutative theories, for example, see a review paper [14].

In the case of both space-space and momentum-momentum noncommuting the consistent NCQM algebra [5] is:

$$[\hat{x}_I, \hat{x}_J] = i\xi^2\theta_{IJ}, \qquad [\hat{x}_I, \hat{p}_J] = i\hbar\delta_{IJ}, \qquad [\hat{p}_I, \hat{p}_J] = i\xi^2\eta_{IJ}, \ (I, J = 1, 2, 3) \tag{2}$$

where θ_{IJ} and η_{IJ} are the antisymmetric constant parameters, independent of the position and momentum. We define $\theta_{IJ} = \epsilon_{IJK}\theta_K$, where ϵ_{IJK} is a three-dimensional antisymmetric unit tensor. We put $\theta_3 = \theta$ and the rest of the θ-components to zero (which can be done by a rotation of coordinates), then we have $\theta_{ij} = \epsilon_{ij}\theta$ $(i, j = 1, 2)$, where ϵ_{ij3} is rewritten as a two-dimensional antisymmetric unit tensor ϵ_{ij}, $\epsilon_{12} = -\epsilon_{21} = 1$, $\epsilon_{11} = \epsilon_{22} = 0$. Similarly, we have $\eta_{ij} = \epsilon_{ij}\eta$. In (2) $\xi = (1 + \theta\eta/4\hbar^2)^{-1/2}$ is the scaling factor which is necessary for consistent perturbation expansions of $(\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_j)$ in terms of the undeformed canonical variables (x_i, p_j) (See Eqs. (4)).

We construct the deformed annihilation-creation operators $(\hat{a}_i,\, \hat{a}_i^\dagger)$ which are related to the deformed canonical variables $(\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_i)$: $\hat{a}_i = \sqrt{\frac{\mu\omega_p}{4\hbar}}\left(\hat{x}_i + i\frac{2}{\mu\omega_p}\hat{p}_i\right)$. When the state vector space of identical bosons is constructed by generalizing one-particle quantum mechanics, in order to maintain Bose-Einstein statistics at the deformed level described by $\hat{a}_i$ the basic assumption is that operators $\hat{a}_i$ and $\hat{a}_j$ should be commuting. This requirement leads to a consistency condition of the NCQM algebra [5]

$$\eta = \mu^2\omega_p^2\theta/4. \tag{3}$$

This condition relates the parameters η to θ. The commutation relations of $\hat{a}_i$ and $\hat{a}_j^\dagger$ are $[\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_1^\dagger] = [\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_2^\dagger] = 1, [\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2] = 0; \quad [\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2^\dagger] = i\xi^2\mu\omega_p\theta/2\hbar$. Here, the first three equations are the same boson algebra as the one in commutative space; The last equation is a new type of boson commutator, called the correlated boson commutator. It encodes effects of spatial noncommutativity at the deformed level described by $(\hat{a}_i, \hat{a}_j^\dagger)$, and correlates different degrees of freedom to each other. It is worth noting that this new commutator is consistent with *all* principles of quantum mechanics and Bose-Einstein statistics. If momentum-momentum were commuting, $\eta = 0$, we could not obtain $[\hat{a}_i, \hat{a}_j] = 0$. It is clear that in order to maintain Bose-Einstein statistics for identical bosons at the deformed level we should consider both space-space noncommutativity and momentum-momentum noncommutativity. In this paper momentum-momentum noncommutativity means the *intrinsic* noncommutativity. It differs from the momentum-momentum noncommutativity in an external magnetic field; In that case the corresponding noncommutative parameter is determined by the external magnetic field. Here both parameters η and θ should be extremely small, which is guaranteed by the consistency condition (3).

Now we consider perturbation expansions of $(\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_j)$. The NCQM algebra (2) has different perturbation realizations [4]. We consider the following consistent ansatz of the perturbation expansions of $\hat{x}_i$ and $\hat{p}_i$

$$\hat{x}_i = \xi(x_i - \theta\epsilon_{ij}p_j/2\hbar), \quad \hat{p}_i = \xi(p_i + \eta\epsilon_{ij}x_j/2\hbar). \tag{4}$$

where x_i and p_i satisfy the undeformed Heisenberg-Weyl algebra $[x_i, x_j] = [p_i, p_j] = 0, [x_i, p_j] = i\hbar\delta_{ij}$.

From (2) and (3) it follows that $[\hat{L}_z, \hat{H}_2] = 0$. Thus $\hat{H}_2, \hat{L}_z$ constitute a complete set of observables of the two-dimensional sub-system. Using (4) we obtain

$$\hat{H}_2 = \frac{1}{2M}(p_i + \frac{1}{2}M\Omega_c\epsilon_{ij}x_j)^2 - \frac{1}{2}Kx_i^2 = \frac{1}{2M}p_i^2 + \frac{1}{2}\Omega_c\epsilon_{ij}p_ix_j + \frac{1}{8}M\Omega_p^2x_i^2, \tag{5}$$

where the effective parameters M, Ω_c, Ω_p and K are defined as $1/M \equiv \xi^2\left(b_1^2/\mu - qV_0\theta^{\,2}/8d^2\hbar^2\right)$, $\Omega_c \equiv \xi^2\left(2b_1b_2/\mu - qV_0\theta/2d^2\hbar\right)$, $M\Omega_p^2 \equiv \xi^2\left(4b_2^2/\mu - 2qV_0/d^2\right)$, $K \equiv M(\Omega_c^2 - \Omega_p^2)/4$, and $b_1 = 1 + qB\theta/4c\hbar$, $b_2 = qB/2c + \eta/2\hbar$. The parameter K consists of the difference of two terms. It is worth noting that the dominant value of K is $qV_0/2d^2 = \mu\omega_z^2/2$, which is positive.

In the following we are interested in the system (5) for the limiting case of vanishing kinetic energy. In this limit the Hamiltonian (5) has non-trivial dynamics, and there are constraints which should be carefully considered [15, 16, 6]. For this purpose it is more convenient to work in the Lagrangian formalism. The limit of vanishing kinetic energy in the Hamiltonian identifies with the limit of the mass $M \to 0$ in the Lagrangian [17]. The point is that when the potential is velocity dependent the limit of vanishing kinetic energy in the Hamiltonian does not corresponds to the limit of vanishing velocity in the Lagrangian. If the velocity approached zero in the Lagrangian, there would be no way to define the corresponding canonical momentum, thus there would be no dynamics.

The first equation of (5) shows that in the limit $M \to 0$ there are constraints $C_i = p_i + \frac{1}{2}M\Omega_c\epsilon_{ij}x_j = 0$, which should be carefully treated [18]. The Poisson brackets of the constraints are $\{C_i, C_j\}_P = M\Omega_c\epsilon_{ij} \neq 0$, so that the corresponding Dirac brackets of the canonical variables x_i, p_j can be determined, $\{x_i, p_j\}_D = \delta_{ij}/2$, $\{x_1, x_2\}_D =$

$-1/M\Omega_c$, $\{p_1, p_2\}_D = -M\Omega_c/4$. The Dirac brackets of C_i with any variables x_i and p_j are zero so that the constraints are strong conditions, and can be used to eliminate the dependent variables. If we select x_1 and p_1 as the independent variables, from the constraints we obtain $x_2 = -2p_1/M\Omega_c$, $p_2 = M\Omega_c x_1/2$. We introduce new canonical variables $q = \sqrt{2}x_1$ and $p = \sqrt{2}p_1$ which satisfy the Heisenberg quantization condition $[q, p] = i\hbar$, and define the effective mass $\mu^* \equiv M^2\Omega_c^2/2K$ and effective frequency $\omega^* \equiv K/M\Omega_c$, then the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_2$ reduces to $H_0 = -\left(\frac{1}{2\mu^*}p^2 + \frac{1}{2}\mu^*\omega^{*2}q^2\right)$. We define an annihilation operator $A = \sqrt{\mu^*\omega^*/2\hbar}\, q + i\sqrt{\hbar/2\mu^*\omega^*}\, p$, and rewrite the Hamiltonian H_0 as $H_0 = -\hbar\omega^*\left(A^\dagger A + 1/2\right)$. Similarly, we rewrite the angular momentum $\hat{L}_z$ as $\hat{L}_z = \hbar\mathcal{L}^*\left(A^\dagger A + 1/2\right)$, where $\mathcal{L}^* = 1 - \xi^2\left(M\Omega_c\theta/4\hbar + \eta/M\Omega_c\hbar\right)$. The eigenvalues of H_0 and $\hat{L}_z$ are, respectively, $E_n^* = -\hbar\omega^*(n + 1/2)$, $\mathcal{L}_n^* = \hbar\mathcal{L}^*(n + 1/2)$, $(n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots)$. The eigenvalue of H_0 is negative, thus unbound. This motion is unstable. It is worth noting that the dominant value of ω^* is the magnetron frequency ω_m, i.e. in the limit of vanishing kinetic energy the surviving motion is magnetron-like, which is more than adequately metastable [19]. The θ and η dependent terms of $\mathcal{L}^*$ take fractional values. Thus the angular momentum possesses fractional eigen values and fractional intervals. The dominant value, i.e. the θ and η independent term, of the zero-point angular momentum $\hbar\mathcal{L}^*/2$ is $\hbar/2$.

For the case of both space-space and momentum-momentum noncommuting we can consider a further limiting process. After the sign of V_0 is changed, the definition of Ω_p shows that the limit of magnetic field $B \to 0$ is meaningful; this implies that the survived system also has non-trivial dynamics. In this limit the frequency ω_p reduces to $\tilde{\omega}_p = \sqrt{2}\omega_z$, the equation (3) becomes a reduced consistency condition $\eta = \mu^2\omega_z^2\theta/2$, and $\xi \to \tilde{\xi} = (1 + \mu^2\omega_z^2\theta^2/8\hbar^2)^{-1/2}$. The effective parameters M, Ω_c, Ω_p and K reduce, respectively, to the following effective parameters $\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Omega}_c, \tilde{\Omega}_p$ and $\tilde{K}$, which are defined by $\tilde{M} \equiv [\tilde{\xi}^2\left(1/\mu + \mu\omega_z^2\theta^2/8\hbar^2\right)]^{-1} = \mu$, $\tilde{\Omega}_c \equiv \tilde{\xi}^2\left(\eta/\mu\hbar + \mu\omega_z^2\theta/2\hbar\right) = \tilde{\xi}^2\mu\omega_z^2\theta/\hbar$, $\tilde{\Omega}_p^2 \equiv \tilde{\xi}^2\left(\eta^2/\mu^2\hbar^2 + 2\omega_z^2\right) = 2\omega_z^2 + O(\theta^2)$, and $\tilde{K} \equiv \frac{1}{4}\tilde{M}\left(\tilde{\Omega}_c^2 - \tilde{\Omega}_p^2\right) = -\frac{1}{2}\mu\omega_z^2 + O(\theta^2)$. In this limit H_0 and $\hat{L}_z$ reduce, respectively, to the following $\tilde{H}_0$ and $\tilde{L}_z$: $\tilde{H}_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\tilde{K}x_i^2 = \hbar\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{A}^\dagger\tilde{A} + 1/2)$, $\tilde{L}_z = \hbar\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{A}^\dagger\tilde{A} + 1/2)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = 1 - \tilde{\xi}^2(\tilde{M}\tilde{\Omega}_c\theta/4\hbar + \eta/\tilde{M}\tilde{\Omega}_c\hbar)$. Where the annihilation operator $\tilde{A} = \sqrt{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\omega}/2\hbar}\, q + i\sqrt{\hbar/2\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\omega}}\, p$, the effective mass $\tilde{\mu} \equiv -\tilde{M}^2\tilde{\Omega}_c^2/2\tilde{K} (> 0)$ and the effective frequency $\tilde{\omega}^2 \equiv (\tilde{K}/\tilde{M}\tilde{\Omega}_c)^2$. From the reduced consistency condition it follows that in $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ the term $\eta/\tilde{M}\tilde{\Omega}_c\hbar = 1/2 + O(\theta^2)$. The eigenvalues of $\tilde{H}_0$ and $\tilde{L}_z$ are, respectively,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{E}_n = \hbar\tilde{\omega}\,(n + 1/2)\,, \\
&\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n = \hbar\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\,(n + 1/2)\,, \tilde{\mathcal{L}} = 1/2 + O(\theta^2), (n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots). \qquad (6)
\end{aligned}
$$

From (6) we conclude that the dominant value of the zero-point angular momentum $\hbar\tilde{\mathcal{L}}/2$ is $\hbar/4$. This explores the essential new feature of spatial noncommutativity.

Testing Spatial Noncommutativity via a Penning Trap - The dominant value $\hbar/4$ of the zero-point angular momentum in a Penning trap can be measured by a Stern-Gerlach-type experiment. The experiment consists of two parts: the trapping region and the Stern-Gerlach experimental region. The trapping region serves as a source of the particles for the Stern-Gerlach experimental region. After establishing the trap, the experiment includes three steps. (i) Taking the limit of vanishing kinetic energy. In an appropriate laser trapping field the speed of the atom can be slowed to the extent that the kinetic energy term may be removed [20]. In the limit of vanishing kinetic energy the harmonic axial oscillation and the cyclotron motion disappear, only the magnetron-like motion survives. The magnetron-like motion is unstable. Fortunately, its damping time is on the order of years [10], so that it is more than adequately metastable. In this limit, the survived magnetron-like motion slowly drifts in a large orbit in the $x - y$ plane. At the quantum level, in the limit of vanishing kinetic energy the mode with the frequency ω^* survives. As we noted before, the dominant value of ω^* is the magnetron frequency ω_m, i.e. the surviving mode is magnetron-like. (ii) Changing the sign of the voltage V_0 and diminishing the magnetic field B to zero. The voltage V_0 is weak enough so that when the magnetic field B approaches zero the trapped particles can escape along the tangent direction of the circle from the trapping region and are injected into the Stern-Gerlach experimental region. (iii) Measuring the z-component of the lowest orbital angular momentum in the Stern-Gerlach experimental region. In the case of both space-space and momentum-momentum noncommuting L_z takes values $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$. The dominant value $\hbar/4$ of the zero-point angular momentum is determined by measuring the deflection of the beam in the Stern-Gerlach experimental region [21].

In the case of only space-space noncommuting the dynamics in the limit of vanishing magnetic field is trivial. The above suggested experiment can distinguish the case of both space-space and momentum-momentum noncommuting from the case of only space-space noncommuting.

For the suggested experiment of Rydberg atoms in [6] the measurement of the lowest angular momentum is frequency dependent, which in turn depends on the parameter θ. The magnitude of θ is surely extremely small [22]; the corresponding frequency is surely extremely large, which may be difficult to reach by current experiments. The situation is different in the Stern-Gerlach-type experiment suggested above, where the measurement of the lowest angular momentum is frequency independent.

The author would like to thank Jean-Patrick Connerade for discussions. This work has been partly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under the grant number 10074014 and by the Shanghai Education Development Foundation.

References

[1] A. Connes, M. R. Douglas, A. Schwarz, JHEP **9802**, 003 (1998); M. R. Douglas, C. M. Hull, JHEP **9802**, 008 (1998); F. Ardalan, H. Arfaei, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, JHEP **9902**, 016 (1999); S-C. Chu, P-M. Ho, Nucl. Phys. **B550**, 151 (1999); S-C. Chu, P-M. Ho, Nucl. Phys. **B568**, 447 (2000); V. Schomerus, JHEP **9906**, 030 (1999); N. Seiberg and E. Witten, JHEP **9909**:032 (1999).

[2] M. Chaichian, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, A. Tureanu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2716 (2001).

[3] J. Gamboa, M. Loewe, J. C. Rojas, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 067901 (2001); A. Hatzinikitas, I. Smyrnakis, J. Math. Phys. **43** 113 (2002); A. Smailagic, E. Spallucci, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 107701 (2002); P-M. Ho, H-C. Kao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 151602 (2002).

[4] V. P. Nair, A. P. Polychronakos, Phys. Lett. **B505**, 267 (2001).

[5] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B584**, 204 (2004).

[6] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 043002 (2004).

[7] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B597**, 362 (2004); Jian-zu Zhang, Coherent States of the Deformed Heisenberg-Weyl algebra in Noncommutative Space, (Accepted by Phys. Lett. **B**).

[8] M. Chaichian, A. Demichev, P. Presnajder, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, A. Tureanu Phys. Lett. **B527**, 149 (2002); M. Chaichian, A. Demichev, P. Presnajder, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, A. Tureanu Nucl. Phys. **B611**, 383 (2001); S. S. Gubser, M. Rangamani, JHEP **0105**: 041 (2001); L. Susskind , **hep-th/0101029**; A. P. Polychronakos , JHEP **0104**: 011 (2001); S. Hellerman, M. V. Raamsdonk, JHEP **0110**: 039 (2001); J. Frenkel, S. H. Pereira, Phy. Rev. **D69**, 127702 (2004); H. Falomir, J. Gamboa, M. Loewe, F. Mendez, J.C. Rojas, Phy. Rev. **D66**, 045018 (2002).

[9] F. M. Penning, Physica, **3**, 873 (1936);

[10] S. L. Brown, G. Gabriels, Rev. Mod. Phys. **58**, 233 (1986);

[11] H. Dehmelt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 525 (1990);

[12] V. A. Kostelecký, in: B. Gruber, T. Otsuka (eds.), Symmetries in Science VII, Plenum, New York, 1994, P. 295.

[13] Jian-zu Zhang, in preparation.

[14] M. R. Douglas, N. A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 977 (2001).

[15] C. Baxter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 514 (1995).

[16] Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 44 (1996).

[17] In (5) in the limit of vanishing kinetic energy, $\frac{1}{2M}\left(p_i + \frac{1}{2}M\Omega_c\epsilon_{ij}x_j\right)^2 = \frac{1}{2}M\dot{x}_i\dot{x}_i \rightarrow 0$, the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_2$ reduces to $H_0 = -\frac{1}{2}Kx_ix_i$. The Lagrangian corresponding to the Hamiltonian (5) is $L = \frac{1}{2}M\dot{x}_i\dot{x}_i + \frac{1}{2}M\Omega_c\epsilon_{ij}x_i\dot{x}_j + \frac{1}{2}Kx_ix_i$. In the limit of $M \rightarrow 0$ this Lagrangian reduces to $L_0 = \frac{1}{2}M\Omega_c\epsilon_{ij}x_i\dot{x}_j + \frac{1}{2}Kx_ix_i$. From L_0 the corresponding canonical momentum is $p_{0i} = \partial L_0/\partial\dot{x}_i = \frac{1}{2}M\Omega_c\epsilon_{ji}x_j$, and the corresponding Hamiltonian is $H_0' = p_{0i}\dot{x}_i - L_0 = -\frac{1}{2}Kx_ix_i = H_0$. Thus we identify the two limiting processes.

[18] M. J. W. Müller-Kirsten, Jian-zu Zhang, Phys. Lett. **A202**, 241 (1995).

[19] The energy in cyclotron motion is almost exclusively kinetic energy. The energy in harmonic axial oscillation alternates between kinetic and potential energy. Reducing the energy in either of these motions reduces their amplitude. In contrast to these two motions, the energy in the magnetron-like motion is almost exclusively potential energy. Thus in the limit of vanishing kinetic energy only the magnetron-like motion survives. Any process that removes energy from the magnetron-like motion increases the magnetron radius until the particle strikes the ring electrode and is lost from the trap. Fortunately, the damping time T_m for the magnetron-like motion, for example for the typical electron trap, is on the order of years [10], so that the magnetron-like motion is more than adequately metastable.

[20] F. Shimizu, K. Shimizu, H. Takuma, Opt. Lett. **16**, 339 (1991).

[21] A consideration of the spin of the trapped particle changes the energy spectrum, but does not change the spectrum of the orbital angular momentum. For the case of spin 1/2, the z-component of the lowest total angular momentum takes dominant values $-\hbar/4$ and $3\hbar/4$. The z-component $\hbar/4$ of the lowest orbital angular momentum is easily red out from the measurement of the deflections of the beam in the Stern-Gerlach experimental region.

[22] There are different bounds on the parameter θ set by experiments. The existing experiments on the Lorentz symmetry violation placed strong bounds on θ [23], $\theta/(\hbar c)^2 \leq (10\ TeV)^{-2}$; Measurements of the Lamb shift [2] give a weaker bound; Clock-comparison experiments [24] claim a stronger bound. The magnitude of θ is surely extremely small. Measurements of the θ dependent terms are out of current experimentat techniques.

[23] S. M. Carroll, J. A. Harvey, V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lan, T. Okamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 141601 (2001).

[24] I. Mocioiu, M. Pospelov, R. Roiban, Phys. Lett. **B489**, 390 (2000).